1		DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA
2	BEFORE THE HONORABLE	E HOWARD D. McKIBBEN, STRICT JUDGE
3	00o	
4		
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,:	No. 3:16-cr-00016-HDM-WGC
6	Plaintiff, :	November 16, 2016
7		United States District Court
8		: 400 S. Virginia Street : Reno, Nevada 89501
9	Defendant. :	TRIAL DAY 2
10	·	
11		
12	TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL PROCEEDINGS	
13		
14	A P P E A R A N C E S:	
15	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	BRIAN L. SULLIVAN Assistant U.S. Attorney
16		100 W. Liberty Street Reno, Nevada 89501
17		Reno, Nevada 09301
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	DENNIS CAMERON Attorney at Law
19		204 Marsh Avenue Reno, Nevada 89509
20		Relio, Nevada 69309
21		
22	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography and produced by computer-aided transcription	
23		
24	Reported by:	LORI URMSTON, RPR, RMR, FAPR
25		NEVADA LICENSE NO. 51 CALIFORNIA LICENSE NO. 3217

1 RENO, NEVADA; WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2016; 9:47 A.M. --000--2 3 (Out of the presence of the jury.) THE CLERK: This is the date and time set for the 4 jury trial, Day 2, in Case No 3:16-cr-16-HDM-WGC, 5 United States of America versus Steven Eugene Ford. 6 7 The defendant is present in custody with counsel, Dennis Cameron. Appearing on behalf of the government 8 is Brian Sullivan. 9 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We've convened outside the presence of the jury. 11 12 The jurors have sent a note to the court. I provided 13 you with a copy of it. And it states: "Can we get a clarification of the definition of diminished capacity, 14 15 that being said, what was told to us about making our 16 judgment with that phrase in mind?" First, in connection with the diminished capacity 17 instruction, it's the basic instruction, patterned 18 instruction, of the Ninth Circuit and it's consistent 19 in the opinion of the Court with the case law, both the 20 21 United States Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit. 2.2 we discussed all of that prior to giving the instruction. 2.3 I am inclined to give a clarification instruction 24 25 to the jury on the diminished capacity so that, you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

know, it's clear, the scope and extent of it. I can see how they might as laypeople wonder what the impact is as it relates to Counts One and Two. And the additional instruction I'm giving thought to -- I haven't, you know, typed it up and given it to you yet -- is something along the following line, that intent is a necessary element in both Counts One and Two of the indictment as described in instructions No. 11 and 12. As to instruction No. 15, which is the diminished capacity instruction, if you conclude that the government has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant had the ability to form the intention to threaten the President of the United States and/or the White House operator, or that he acted with the intent to threaten the President and/or the White House telephone operator, then you would return a not quilty verdict. Now, the reason I'm inclined to go with that language is that I think the jurors need to know the consequence of their deliberations and determination with respect to the intent issue. So that's what I would do. On the other hand, I will tell the jury that in the event they find beyond a reasonable doubt that the

qovernment has established each one of the elements

```
under Count One and Count Two as set forth in
    instructions No. 11 and 12, including the intent
 2
    element, then their verdict would be for the
 3
    government, it would be a quilty verdict. And that's a
 4
    clarification on both sides of it.
 5
        So what's the government's position on that?
 6
 7
        MR. SULLIVAN: Your Honor, I'm going to reiterate
    my request. They need some help. This instruction,
 8
    this Ninth Circuit instruction, is not all that clear.
 9
10
    And that's why I asked for you to take the language --
        THE COURT: Let's tackle what I'm talking about
11
    first --
12
13
        MR. SULLIVAN:
                       Well, no.
        THE COURT: -- and then I'll let you expand it into
14
15
    whatever else you think should be put in there.
16
        MR. SULLIVAN: I have no objection to what you've
    just stated.
17
        THE COURT: Okay. What about the defense?
18
        MR. CAMERON: Your Honor, I think that states what
19
    the issue is in this trial and what we've argued about
20
21
    all day, so I don't have any objection to the language
2.2
    the Court has just announced.
        THE COURT: All right. Let me just finish this
23
24
    then.
25
        So let me restate it. And then I can go ahead and
```

type it up before I bring them back and give it to them. 2. And then I'll address whatever issue you have, 3 Mr. Sullivan. 4 Intent is a necessary -- in responding to the 5 question you posed to the Court, I would advise you as 6 7 a further instruction, to be included with all the other instructions that I've provided to you, that intent is a necessary element in both Counts One and 10 Two of the indictment. As described in the instructions under instruction No. 15, if you conclude 11 that the government has failed to prove beyond a 12 13 reasonable doubt that the defendant had the ability to form the intention to threaten the President of the 14 15 United States and/or the White House telephone 16 operator, or that he acted with the intent to threaten the President and/or the White House telephone 17 operator, then you would return a not guilty verdict. 18 19 On the other hand, if you find that the government has proven all of the elements of Count One and Two of the 20 21 indictment as set forth in instructions 11 and 12, 2.2 including the intent element, you would return a guilty verdict. And you will consider this along with all the 23 other instructions. 2.4 25 So that's what I would intend to give to them.

```
1
    I'll go ahead and get that typed up now. And then
   while we're doing that, I'll talk with you about the
2
3
    issue that you wish to discuss.
       MR. SULLIVAN: Do you want me to proceed?
4
        THE COURT: Let me just get this to --
5
       Do you want to take this in and we'll go ahead and
6
7
   have that typed up and then I'll give it to counsel.
        Okay. Go ahead.
8
9
       MR. SULLIVAN: As I was starting to say, Your
10
   Honor, this Ninth Circuit instruction is very brief.
                                                           Ι
11
   can kind of understand the fact that they sent out a
          And that was my point in suggesting and
12
13
   requesting actually the language that I did from the
   Christian case. And I'm requesting it again, because
14
15
   even though I don't object to what you're -- the
16
   response, it doesn't answer their question.
        They want some help here. And I think the
17
   Christian case gives them that help from the language
18
19
    that states, "The diminished capacity defense is not
   cognizable" -- I realize that you could change that
20
21
   word to "available" -- "is not available simply because
2.2
   a criminal defendant may be mentally ill. Instead, the
   defense is directly concerned with whether the
23
   defendant possessed the ability to attain the culpable
24
   state of mind which defines the crime." I request that
25
```

```
1
    you add that language at the end of what you've already
   had typed up.
 2
 3
        THE COURT: Yeah, let me pull that case again.
    thought I had it right here.
 4
        MR. SULLIVAN: And it's in the file.
                                               It's in --
 5
    the language that I'm quoting from is from one of my
 6
 7
    pleadings. It's document No. 33, if you have the
    court's file.
 9
        THE COURT: Yeah.
                          I actually have the case too,
10
   but I just need to --
        MR. SULLIVAN: And I have the citation for the case
11
    if you -- and the page number.
12
13
        THE COURT: Yeah, I have it here.
                       If you have the case, it's on page
14
        MR. SULLIVAN:
15
    815.
16
        THE COURT:
                    The problem with what you're suggesting
    is that that suggests to the jury almost that a person
17
    who is mentally ill, that the jury not take that into
18
19
    consideration necessarily in connection with finding
    diminished capacity, which is not true. They certainly
20
21
    can take that into consideration, but the fact that
2.2
    they're mentally ill may not always be sufficient to
    have the diminished capacity instruction, but it may be
23
    if it's substantial enough on the issue of intent, that
24
25
    intent couldn't have been formed. That's the problem I
```

have with it. MR. SULLIVAN: I have no problem with you 2 3 expounding on what you just said there, what you just I think the point is that we -- you allowed the 4 defendant to raise this defense. No real expert 5 testimony was offered by either side to explain stuff 6 7 that was brought out. And I think it's only fair that they understand that even though you allowed me to argue it and even though you may have some form of 9 10 mental illness, it's only -- it only counts if it rises to such a degree that it interferes with your ability 11 to form that intent which is what I think you just 12 13 said. THE COURT: 14 I agree with that. 15 MR. SULLIVAN: That's what I'm asking for. 16 MR. CAMERON: Your Honor, I would like to be heard as well on that issue. 17 THE COURT: Go ahead. 18 19 MR. CAMERON: And, you know, I understand Mr. Sullivan's desire to have that language added, but 20 21 that's really what he argued to the jury, and he's had 2.2 the opportunity to make that argument to them already. The pattern instruction covers what the jury needs to 23 We've made our argument; the government has made 24 know. 25 theirs. They had the information. It's their duty and

1 their province to decide now how that affects his ability to form intent. 2 3 The fact that there's not an expert called is just a red herring in this case. The bottom line is the 4 expert is there to assist the jury in maybe making some 5 determinations about the facts. They have the facts in 6 7 this case. And I think the instruction the Court propounded originally covers their question and directs 9 them to go back and look at the facts of the case. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's wait until we have this typed up and then I'll bring it to you and we'll 11 take a look at it. In the meantime, let me ponder this 12 13 issue. So if you want to relax for a few minutes, you may. I'll probably just work right here. 14 15 MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Paris, do you want to give them We'll start with this. 17 these. So, again, just on this language -- we'll just deal 18 19 with this right now. Intent is a necessary element in both -- I'd just say in Counts One and Two of the 20 21 indictment. As to instruction No. 15 -- and there I'll 2.2 say the diminished capacity instruction -- if you conclude that the government has failed to prove beyond 23 a reasonable doubt that the defendant had the ability 24 25 to form the intention to threaten the President of the

1 United States and/or the White House telephone operator, or that he acted with the intent to threaten 2 the President of the United States and/or the telephone 3 operator, then you would return a not quilty verdict. 4 On the other hand, if you find that the government has 5 proven all of the elements of Counts One and Two of the 6 7 indictment as set forth in instructions 11 and 12, including the intent element, you would return a guilty verdict. 9 10 Now, here's some possible language in connection with the issue that's been raised by Mr. Sullivan. And 11 12 this is language which I'm taking from the case and 13 revising it somewhat. And by "the case" I mean the 14 United States versus Christian case which is 749 15 Federal 3006. Mental illness standing alone is not a basis for 16 finding the defendant not quilty because of diminished 17 18 capacity. The issue for you to decide in this case is whether defendant's mental condition and/or state of 19 mind on March 1, 2016, was such that he could or could 20 21 not form the specific intent to threaten the President 2.2 of the United States and/or the White House telephone 23 operator. 24 MR. SULLIVAN: I have no objection and I strongly 25 encourage the Court to add that language. I think that

1 gives them the direction that they're looking for. Let me at least type it up here so you THE COURT: 2 can look at what I've said. I haven't decided what I'm 3 going to do with it yet. 4 And just type it up at the bottom of -- type it up 5 at the bottom of the one that Candace did. And have 6 7 her take out "as described in," so it would just read "intent is a necessary element in both Counts One and 8 Two of the indictment." 9 10 Okay. Thanks. Now, while we're waiting for that, I want to 11 simply make the record in connection with the excuse of 12 13 juror Ms. Villafana yesterday afternoon at her request that she be excused from jury duty in connection with 14 15 the Court's determination with respect to good cause under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Criminal 16 Procedure. 17 At the time that we received the note -- and I 18 recognize that counsel stipulated to it, but I want the 19 record to reflect this, that at the time that we 20 received the notification from Ms. Villa -- I think 21 2.2 it's Villafana -- the jury had been deliberating for approximately 20 minutes. In other words, by the time 23 they got out, closed the door after they deposited 24 25 their cell phones and what have you, they had been

deliberating for about 20 minutes before I brought them
in to see if they wanted to continue in the evening or
go home. And I got her note at the time that they
indicated that they in all probability were going to go
home and then come back the next day.

2.2

There is absolutely no evidence from either

Ms. Villafana or any of the other jurors that she was
in any way a dissenting juror. No issues were raised
by any of the other jurors as to her ability to
proceed. Her expression to the Court was that she was
having difficulty with opinions of all of the jurors,
not given jurors or specific ones, and participating in
the jury process.

The record is quite clear that she was having problems with the jury process. She immediately upon being selected and going to the jury room before the trial evidence started indicated that she had to leave at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon because they had one car and she had to pick her husband up. And then at the Court's urging that she reconsider on that, she was able to make other arrangements.

She, in addition, was 15 minutes late in coming back from the lunch break. And that was of concern to the Court, because we had to wait on that. I had the impression that she was not particularly happy about

2.2

the fact that the Court was going to have the jury come back, because it was after that admonition to the jury that I preferred to have them come back the next day for deliberations that she would necessarily have to come back the next day for jury deliberations.

So all of those factors together, including the very short length of time that the jurors were in there, about 20 minutes, convinced the Court that she was not particularly interested in continuing to participate in this trial and that's the reason she sent the note out to the Court. And counsel agreed with the Court that it was appropriate to go ahead and dismiss her. And we did have the two alternates still standing by here.

And then the other alternate was instructed along with the rest of the jurors that the jury had to start their deliberations anew, which would have been to discuss whatever they may or may not have discussed, whether it was just preliminary things in connection with selecting a foreperson or what during that 20-minute period that they had been out.

So for all of those reasons the Court believes that there was good cause to excuse Ms. Villafana and that there was no basis for any conclusion in this case that it was because of some conflict she had with one or

```
1
   more of the jurors about the deliberations themselves
   or reaching any kind of a verdict in the case.
2
3
   believe counsel agreed with that and had stipulated
   that she could be excused. So that constitutes the
4
   good cause for her excuse under Rule 23. It is so
5
   ordered.
6
7
        Let's go ahead and give that to counsel. Let's
   just take a look at this. I haven't decided exactly
8
9
   what I'm going to do on this.
10
        I thought I said too as to Count -- as to
    instruction No. 15, the diminished capacity
11
    instruction --
12
13
        MR. CAMERON: That's what I have, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: I think I probably hadn't written that
14
15
   down or something.
        MR. SULLIVAN: I wrote that down too.
16
        THE COURT: As to instruction No. 15, the
17
   diminished capacity, if you conclude that the
18
19
   government has failed to prove beyond a reasonable
   doubt that the defendant had the ability to form the
20
21
    intention to threaten the President of the United
2.2
   States and/or the White House telephone operator, or
    that he acted with the intent to threaten the President
23
   of the United States and/or the White House telephone
24
25
   operator -- and I could put in there on March 1, 2016.
```

```
1
       MR. CAMERON:
                      I have no objection to that, Your
   Honor.
2
3
       MR. SULLIVAN: Neither do I. And I see a typo.
                                                          On
   line 8 it says "they" and I think you mean "then."
4
        THE COURT: -- then you would -- right. I was just
5
   on that word.
                   Thank you.
6
7
        -- then you would return a not guilty verdict.
   the other hand, if you find that the government has
8
9
   proven all of the elements of Counts One and Two of the
10
    indictment as set forth in instructions 11 and 12,
    including the intent element, you would return a quilty
11
   verdict. Mental illness standing alone is not a basis
12
13
   for finding the defendant not guilty because of
   diminished capacity. The issue for you to decide is
14
15
   whether defendant's mental condition and/or state of
   mind on March 1, 2016, was such that he could -- he
16
   could or -- yeah, that he could or could not form the
17
    specific intent to threaten the President of the United
18
19
   States and/or the White House telephone operator.
       MR. SULLIVAN:
                       Perfect.
20
21
        THE COURT: And your position on this?
2.2
       MR. CAMERON: Your Honor, I'm good with it up to
    the final paragraph. And the reason for that is I
23
   understand the case that the government is citing, but
24
25
   every case is different and the circumstances of every
```

case is different. In this particular case we've given instructions to the jury. And I don't mind expanding 2 3 it up to paragraphs one and two. But the government argued vociferously the fact that he has mental illness 4 isn't enough to trigger that. And I think the jury 5 heard our argument. They have to decide whether his 6 7 mental illness was to such a state that he could not form the intent. THE COURT: I think there's a little merit to what 9 10 you're saying. At line 13 I would be inclined to say this: Mental illness standing alone may not be a basis 11 for finding the defendant not quilty because of 12 13 diminished capacity. The issue for you to decide is whether defendant's mental condition and/or state of 14 15 mind on March 1, 2016, was such that he could or could 16 not form the specific intent to threaten the President of the United States. 17 MR. CAMERON: And that's a paragraph that I'm not 18 19 content with, Your Honor. And if I can just expand 20 further. Having already given the jury instructions 21 and having the arguments made regarding those instructions, for the Court to come back now and echo 2.2 the government's argument I think invades the province 23 of the jury to the extent that they have the case, they 24 25 have the evidence, they know what the facts are.

```
1
        The first part of the instruction explains to them
   how they have to apply those, but I think to basically
2
3
   vouch for the government's argument I think tips the
   scales unnecessarily. And the Court doesn't have to
4
   include this language. They're quite capable of making
5
   that determination based on the first part of the
6
7
    instruction. That's the issue.
        THE COURT: You know what I may do is just go with
8
9
    the -- starting with the second line, which would be at
10
   line 14, the issue for you to decide is whether
   defendant's mental condition and/or state of mind on
11
   March 1, 2016, was such that he could or could not form
12
13
   the specific intent to threaten the President of the
   United States and/or the White House telephone
14
15
   operator.
16
       MR. CAMERON: And I could live with that language,
   Your Honor.
17
        THE COURT:
                    I think that's what I'm going to do.
18
19
    think that tracks what you said.
       MR. SULLIVAN: It doesn't really directly answer.
20
21
    I think what they're having trouble with, Your Honor,
2.2
    is -- well, they need to be told that just because you
   have a mental illness doesn't mean that that's an
23
   immediate defense. That seems to be what they're
24
25
   wanting some clarification on here. And that language
```

```
that you drafted -- and I have no trouble with whether
    it's "is" or "may" -- tells them exactly what the
2
3
   Christian case says. And I don't think you are
   singling out -- I think you have -- singling out the
4
   government's argument. I think that you're basically
5
   telling them, look, I'm referring you back to these
6
   instructions on intent. You have to consider the
7
   intent factor and you need to decide whether it was
9
   sufficient enough that he could or could not form the
10
   specific intent to commit both of these crimes.
        I think all you're telling them is that just
11
   because there may be some mental illness or you find
12
13
   some mental illness, that alone is not going to excuse
   his conduct. It has to rise -- it has to be a
14
15
   significant amount.
                    Okay. Well, I'm going to retype this.
16
        THE COURT:
   And here's the final version of what I'm going to
17
18
            And then we'll note any objections on the
            And then I'll see if they ask for further
19
    instruction later.
20
21
        Intent is a necessary element in both Counts One
   and Two of the indictment. As to instruction No. 15,
2.2
    the diminished capacity instruction, if you conclude
23
   that the government has failed to prove beyond a
24
25
   reasonable doubt that the defendant had the ability to
```

```
form the intention to threaten the President of the
   United States and/or the White House telephone
2
   operator, or that he acted with the intent to threaten
3
   the President of the United States and/or the White
4
   House telephone operator, on March 1, 2016, then you
5
   would return a not quilty verdict. On the other hand,
6
7
   if you find that the defendant has proven all of the
   elements of Counts One and Two of the indictment as set
   forth in instructions 11 and 12, including the intent
9
10
   element, you would return a guilty verdict. The issue
   for you to decide is whether defendant's mental
11
   condition and/or state of mind on March 1, 2016, was
12
13
   such that he could or could not form the specific
    intent to threaten the President of the United States
14
15
   and/or the White House telephone operator.
        The issue for you to decide -- I think I should say
16
    the issue for you to decide -- on the diminished
17
   capacity instruction, I want to say that, because there
18
   are other issues they have to decide.
19
             Let's go ahead and retype this. And then we
20
21
   will give it to the -- to counsel and then I'll
2.2
   probably go with that and call them back in and provide
    them with the additional instruction.
2.3
             Let's just take a couple minutes.
24
       Okay.
25
   you, counsel, for addressing it. I think you've
```

```
1
   provided good input to the court.
                  (Pause in the proceedings.)
2
3
        THE COURT: Okay. What I may do on line 14 -- the
    issue for you to decide on the diminished capacity
4
    instruction is whether the defendant's mental condition
5
   and/or state of mind on March 1, 2016, was such that
6
7
   he -- and then instead of what I've got there -- lacked
   the capacity to form the intent to -- specific intent
    to threaten the President of the United States or the
9
10
   White House telephone operator. I think I may use that
   language.
11
        -- he lacked the capacity to form the specific
12
13
    intent to threaten the President of the United States
   and/or the White House telephone operator. I think
14
15
    that's consistent with the evidence, consistent with
16
    the law, and taken also language from the Christian
17
          And I think that puts it in the proper context.
        So this is the instruction then in the form I would
18
    intend to give it the jurors. Does the government have
19
   any objection other than what you stated on the record?
20
21
       MR. SULLIVAN: No, I have no objection to that
2.2
   modification. I still, of course, request that you
    include that first sentence that you had before.
2.3
        THE COURT: Does the defense have any objection?
24
25
       MR. CAMERON:
                      I do not, Your Honor.
```

```
1
        THE COURT:
                    All right. Let's go ahead and bring
    the jurors back then and I'll reinstruct them.
                                                     This
2
3
   will be Supplemental Instruction No. 1.
        THE CLERK:
                    Are you going to retype it one more
4
   time, Judge?
5
        THE COURT: I'm going to read it to them now.
6
7
   then I'll give it to them as soon as they come in -- or
   go back for deliberations. So let's go ahead and bring
8
9
    the jurors in.
                    Thank you.
10
                (In the presence of the jury.)
        THE COURT: You may all be seated.
11
        The jurors are all present. So stipulated,
12
13
   counsel?
        MR. SULLIVAN: So stipulated, Your Honor.
14
15
        MR. CAMERON: So stipulated, Your Honor.
16
        THE COURT: Thank you.
        Good morning, members of the jury.
17
        I received a note from you this morning, and I'll
18
19
   just read it. "Can we get a clarification on the
   definition of diminished capacity, that being said,
20
21
   what was told to us about making our judgment with the
2.2
   phrase in mind."
        Normally I just restate the instruction for you.
23
    In this event I felt it was appropriate to give you
24
25
   some additional instruction with respect to that
```

1 particular instruction. Keep in mind you're to consider this additional instruction I give you along 2 with all the other instructions I've given you. 3 not to be isolated, but it will give you a further 4 definition and explanation of the diminished capacity 5 instruction that I've provided to you. And I have it 6 7 typed up, so I'll give a copy of it to you so you can take it into the jury room with you after I finish 9 reading it to you. 10 Intent is a necessary element in both Counts One and Two of the indictment. As to instruction No. 15, 11 the diminished capacity instruction, if you conclude 12 13 that the government has failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant had the ability to 14 15 form the intention to threaten the President of the United States and/or the White House telephone 16 operator, or that he acted with the intent to threaten 17 the President of the United States or the White House 18 telephone operator on March 1, 2016, then you would 19 return a not quilty verdict. On the other hand, if you 20 21 find that the government has proven all of the elements 2.2 of Counts One and Two of the indictment as set forth in instructions 11 and 12, including the intent element, 23 you would return a quilty verdict. 24 25 The issue for you to decide on the diminished

```
1
   capacity instruction is whether defendant's mental
   condition and/or state of mind on March 1, 2016, was
2
3
   such that he lacked the capacity to form the specific
    intent to threaten the President of the United States
   and/or the White House telephone operator.
5
        And that will be Supplemental Instruction No. 1.
6
7
   And I'll send that to the jury room with you, and
   that's my further clarification of the diminished
8
9
   capacity instruction. Thank you very much. You may
10
   retire and continue your deliberations.
11
              (Out of the presence of the jury.)
12
        THE COURT: And I'll give you a final form of this,
13
   so just hang in for a few minutes.
        Okay. We'll let you know if we hear again
14
15
   something.
16
                     (A recess was taken.)
17
                (In the presence of the jury.)
        THE COURT: You may be seated. The jurors sent a
18
   note and indicated they've reached a verdict, so we
19
   will call them back.
20
21
        On the record, counsel, you'll stipulate to the
2.2
   response I gave the jurors on the transcript that we
   have -- we had the recording of all of the testimony
23
   here, but we don't have a transcript of it and I told
24
25
   them to rely on their recollection of the testimony of
```

```
1
   all of the witnesses.
        MR. SULLIVAN: So stipulated, Your Honor.
2
3
        MR. CAMERON: We would stipulate as well, Your
   Honor.
4
        THE COURT:
                    Thank you very much.
5
        You may all be seated.
6
7
        All right. Will counsel stipulate that all the
   jurors are present?
8
9
        MR. SULLIVAN: So stipulated, Your Honor.
10
        MR. CAMERON: Yes, Your Honor.
11
        THE COURT: All right. I received a note
    indicating that the jury has reached verdicts.
12
13
        It's signed by you, Mr. Vincent?
        JUROR VINCENT: Yes.
14
15
        THE COURT: Are you the foreperson of the jury?
16
        JUROR VINCENT:
                        Yes.
        THE COURT: Without stating what verdicts the jury
17
   has reached, has the jury reached a unanimous verdict
18
   on both Count One and Count Two?
19
        JUROR VINCENT:
20
                        Yes.
21
        THE COURT: All right. And did you sign the
2.2
   verdict forms?
        JUROR VINCENT:
23
                        Yes.
        THE COURT: And are they contained in the envelope?
24
25
        JUROR VINCENT: Yes, they are.
```

```
1
        THE COURT:
                    Thank you.
       Ms. Clerk, if you would secure the envelope, I'll
2
3
   take a look at it. Thank you.
       Ms. Clerk, if you'll read the verdict, please.
4
        THE CLERK: "We, the jury in the above-entitled
5
   case, upon our oath do state that we find the Defendant
6
7
   Steven Eugene Ford guilty of the offense charged in
   Count One of the indictment herein; that we find the
8
9
   Defendant Steven Eugene Ford not quilty of the offense
10
   charged in Count Two of the indictment herein. Dated
    this 16th day of November, 2016, Foreperson."
11
        THE COURT: Members of the jury, as to Count One,
12
    is this your verdict, so say you one, so say you all?
13
    If it is, please state "Yes."
14
15
                (Collective yeses by the jury.)
        THE COURT: As to Count Two, is this your unanimous
16
   verdict, that each of you individually vote not guilty
17
   as to Count Two?
18
19
                (Collective yeses by the jury.)
        THE COURT: All right. Does either the government
20
21
   or the defense wish to have the jury polled?
2.2
       MR. SULLIVAN: No, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: Does the defense?
23
       MR. CAMERON: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
24
25
        THE COURT:
                    All right. The court records will
```

```
1
   reflect that it is a unanimous verdict. Each of the
   jurors responded "Yes" in connection to my question
2
   that they found the defendant guilty of Count One and
3
   not quilty of Count Two.
        Ms. Clerk, you'll record the verdicts of the jury
5
    in the minutes of the court.
6
7
        This matter will be referred to the Department of
   Probation for a presentence report. And I will
8
9
   continue the case for purposes of imposition of
10
   judgment and sentence until what date?
        THE CLERK: Until Tuesday, February 7th, 2017, at
11
   10:00 a.m.
12
13
        THE COURT: Is that satisfactory at least at this
   point, counsel?
14
15
        MR. CAMERON: Yes.
16
        MR. SULLIVAN: May I have one moment, Your Honor?
17
   February 17th, 2017, at 10:00 a.m.?
18
        THE CLERK: February 7th, 2017, at 10:00 a.m.
        MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, that's fine, Your Honor.
19
        THE COURT: Is that fine?
20
21
        MR. CAMERON: Yes, Your Honor.
2.2.
        THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
        I would like to thank all of you for serving on
23
   this jury. It's not easy to sit in judgment of someone
24
25
   else.
           There are occasions where cases are tried before
```

1 me without a jury, so I know how difficult it is. You were very patient and considerate. You 2 considered all the evidence in the case. And I 3 appreciate your services. Our system of justice works, 4 as I indicated yesterday when you were impaneled, 5 because we have jurors like you that are willing to 6 devote the time and attention to these cases and to 7 exercise your best judgment in reaching a final 9 decision in the case. So I deeply appreciate your services. It is what makes our Constitution work. 10 Everybody is entitled to a fair and impartial jury, and 11 you were certainly a fair and impartial jury. And I 12 13 appreciate all of your service. I hope you will tell those that -- your family or 14 15 those with whom you work, or both, that the Court 16 really appreciates the fact that they were able to make the time available so that you could be here. So thank 17 them for me too. 18 On behalf of all the judges of our court, I extend 19 my deep appreciation to you for the time and attention 20 21 you gave to this case and the sacrifices that you had to make. 2.2 You're no longer going to be under a restriction 23 from me not to discuss the case. In other words, now 24 25 that you have rendered your verdicts and they have been 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

put in as part of the minutes of the court and a judgment will be rendered ultimately accordingly, you are free to talk about the case if you want to. You can discuss it with anybody, but you don't have to. want you to understand what your rights are. Keep in mind that all of you discussed that case in the jury room in private among yourselves with an understanding that what you were saying was said in that jury room. So I would just express my caution, having been on the bench for almost 40 years now, that you may wish to discuss what you did but not necessarily unless you're ordered by the court. think I've only had to bring either one or two juries in over all those years to impeach a verdict or to talk about anything in connection with a verdict, so it's unlikely that there would be anything like that in this But unless I order it, you're not under any obligation to speak with anybody about this case. If anybody should approach you and try to talk with you about the case, just indicate the judge says you don't have to talk about the case, and you don't. So I just want you to understand what your rights are. up to you to decide. You're very reasonable men and That's clear to me during the course of this women. trial, so I know that you'll do what's appropriate.

1 Again, thank you very much. I'm going to direct that you not be asked to serve on a federal jury again 2 in the District of Nevada for the next two years. 3 Ιf you want to serve again, you can always let our 4 commissioner know and then she won't take you off the 5 rolls, but otherwise you'll automatically be taken off 6 7 the roll. If you do get a summons to appear, don't ignore it, call and we'll make sure if we made a mistake that your name is taken off. 10 If you took notes during the trial, you can either keep those notes or put them in the jury room. Nobody 11 will look at them. They'll be destroyed. And we will 12 13 pick up anything else. Make sure you pick up your cell phones before you leave. And if there are any other 14 15 personal items that you have, please pick those up. 16 Again, thank you very much. Our system of justice works because of people like you. Perhaps I'll see you 17 again if I'm still here two years from now and you're 18 called on jury duty again. I would be delighted to 19 have you serve on another case. So thank you. You're 20 21 excused. 2.2 (The jury left the courtroom.) THE COURT: All right. You may be seated. 23 I think that's all I have unless the government has 24 25 anything else to add.

```
1
        MR. SULLIVAN: No, I don't have anything else.
        THE COURT: Does the defense?
2
3
       MR. CAMERON: No, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: Thank you very much. Counsel, you both
4
   did a fine job on behalf of your respective -- the
5
   parties that you represent. I appreciate it. You've
6
7
   been very respectful of the court, and I appreciate
   that. You've served justice well. So thank you for
9
   all you've done here.
10
        The matter is continued for sentencing until that
   date, and we'll receive the presentence report.
                                                      If you
11
   have objections to the report, then you'll file those
12
13
   in accordance with the rules of the court. Thank you
   very much.
14
        We'll be in recess.
15
16
         (The proceedings were concluded at 1:11 p.m.)
17
                            --000--
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

```
1
    STATE OF NEVADA
                        SS.
    COUNTY OF WASHOE
2
3
         I, LORI URMSTON, Certified Court Reporter, in and
4
    for the State of Nevada, do hereby certify:
5
         That the foregoing proceedings were taken by me
6
7
    at the time and place therein set forth; that the
    proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and
8
    thereafter transcribed via computer under my
9
10
    supervision; that the foregoing is a full, true and
    correct transcription of the proceedings to the best
11
    of my knowledge, skill and ability.
12
13
         I further certify that I am not a relative nor an
    employee of any attorney or any of the parties, nor am
14
    I financially or otherwise interested in this action.
15
         I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws
16
    of the State of Nevada that the foregoing statements
17
    are true and correct.
18
19
         DATED: At Reno, Nevada, this 6th day of
20
    April, 2017.
21
22
                             LORI URMSTON, CCR #51
2.3
24
                             LORI URMSTON, CCR #51
25
```